



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/797,572

03/11/2004

John Peter Walsh

16240.M293

4803

7590

10/01/2009

Joseph W Berenato III
Liniak, Berenato & White, LLC
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

LAUX, JESSICA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3635

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/21/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner does not dispute that Moyes discloses a composite wood and the office action does not state that Moyes expressly discloses the use of other materials. The previous office action merely points out that Moyes does not expressly restrict the invention to only a composite wood (i.e. Moyes does not teach away from using other materials). Nowhere in Moyes is it disclosed that the method is suitable only for a composite wood having resin and therefore a person reading Moyes "as a whole" would not have concluded that its teachings are limited. Rather one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that method Moyes is certainly suitable for the disclosed material and further would have the common sense or knowledge to pursue other known materials because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp, and if this leads to the anticipated success it is a product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

Additionally it is noted that the portion of Phillips stating "under no circumstances should the temperature be permitted to rise above about 50 degrees Celsius" is in reference to the method of forming the flat blank or plywood board. That section goes on to state that "after the flat assembly has been united into one structure... sufficient heat and pressure should be applied to the structure so as to deform it into the desired shape". This "sufficient heat and pressure" is not restricted by the previously mentioned temperatures restrictions as it is for a molding the board not forming the board.

Art Unit: 3635

(Reference Col. 3) Phillips goes not to disclose that there are many accepted methods of forming plywood and Phillips is only disclosing one acceptable method.

Therefore in view of the both Moyes and Phillips and the above noted and previously presented remarks the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pursue known options (such as molding techniques and material choices, where all the claimed method steps and materials are disclosed or known in the art) to form a molded door skin and that should such modifications or substitutions performed in said pursuit achieve a desired or predictable result such as an improved door skin having realistic looking aesthetics while being manufactured efficiently and cost effectively then the product is not novel but obvious.

/Richard E. Chilcot, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3635